

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 through 13, 15, 17 through 23, 25, 27 through 33, 35, 37 through 45, 47, 49 through 51, 53, 55, 56 and 76 through 84 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 through 11, 23, 25, 27 through 33, 35, 37 through 45, 47, 49 through 51, 53, 55, 56, and 76 through 84 are allowed. Applicants appreciate the allowance of such claims.

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of November 23, 2004.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,342,434

Claims 12, 13, 15 and 17 through 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,342,434). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants further submit that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure.

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants assert that the Miyamoto et al. reference does not and cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 12 because, at the very least, the Miyamoto et al. reference does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicants assert that the Miyamoto et al. reference does not teach or suggest the claim limitation of presently amended independent claim 12 calling for "applying an adhesive to solely a portion of said bumps on said surface of said wafer". At best, the Miyamoto et al. reference teaches or suggests applying a layer of resist to a

layer of the entire surface of the bumps 2b on the wafer 2. Such is not the presently claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 12. Therefore, presently amended independent claim 12 is allowable as well as dependent claims 13, 15, and 17 through 22 therefrom.

Applicants submit that claims 12, 13, 15, and 17 through 22 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 12, 13, 15, and 17 through 22 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: February 23, 2005
JRD/djp:lmh
Document in ProLaw